

1/24/85

Walter H. Brown
Box 352
Berkeley CA 94701

Dear Walter,

Your remarks in regard to Frank Wilkinsons review of Jan Encyclopedia in the 1/15/85 issue of "Penny-wise" have been read by me. I believe that you have misrepresented certain items that I must comment on.

① You mentioned that I received Xerox copies of the Drugged But Section of your book and that I should have reported to you any corrections that I came up with

The Misrepresentation is that:

a. The Xerox copies were received by me in May 1984 and even if I had sent you corrections I doubt you would have had them made. As it results your printing got underway in June 1983

b. For me to have sent you all my corrections of FACTUAL errors would have required a major overhaul of the entire text that I read.

I am still finding major errors such as last night when I came across the statement that the Obverse of ¹⁸⁰⁰ Gilbert No. 2 (CMM #12) (Brown No 1) had a bootless T of L. B. & T. V. and may have been made in 1804 etc. There are incredible errors in your text. Not opinion ones such as your classifying M & 1800 struck from minted dies as overstruck over a large cent when no undertype is visible; but MAJOR factual errors. The Condition Census is so bad that anyone relying on it is being grossly misled mainly due to

(2)

John Hanson efforts to Promote his own Collection.

Misrepresentation (2) Involves the statement in your book that 1794 Variates 3,4,5,6, with large edge letters were Not Previously Mentioned by any Previous writer.

I am enclosing a copy of a Supplement to my First edition which was made up in October 1976. Thus your statement about relying on my First edition is again another Misrepresentation which fortunately for the Half Cent Collector is a ~~well~~ well known item.

There have been NO copies of the sent to any one I just wanted to let you know how I reacted to your statement in P.W. and what I consider to be your continued Misrepresentation of many things.

As far as the scholarship of your Half Cent book I consider it to be Virtually Non-Existent. I am in the process of writing a Page by Page Critique which hopefully will be done in less than 30 years..

Sincerely

Robert S. Calhoun.

October, 1976

Since the publication of this book in December 1971, no new dies have been discovered to my knowledge. Also, no new combinations of previously known dies have been discovered.

For the year 1794 Varieties #3, #4, #5 and #6 are now known with large edge lettering as illustrated on Page 6. All of these Subvarieties are R-8 at the present time. It is interesting to note that Varieties #4 and #5 were previously mentioned as existing by Commodore W. C. Eaton in the "Numismatist" for November 1921.

In the year 1795 a specimen of Variety #^{3a} is now known to exist without edge lettering. ~~Thus a genuine Gilbert No. 2 has been found.~~ I do not consider this to be a new Subvariety as explained on Pages VIII and 17.

Rarity on a number of Variety has decreased and as time goes on there will probably be further decreases. Listed below are Varieties which have changed since publication.

<u>Date</u>	<u>Variety #</u>	<u>Present Estimate of Rarity</u>
1794	4	3
1794	5	4
1795	6b	6
1802	1	6
1803	4	3
1804	1	3
1804	2	7
1804	3	Delisted as Variety
1804	4	5
1804	5	4
1804	7	5
1805	2	6
1805	3	5
1806	2	4
1806	3	6
1808	1	7
1809	1	6
1809	2	3
1809	3	1
1809	6	1
1810	1	2
1825	1	3
1832	1	2

(A) ✓ ~~Defence Force~~ ^{Los Angeles} ~~Submarine~~ ^{Submarine}
✓ ~~Underwater~~ ^{Underwater} ~~Submarine~~ ^{Submarine}
✓ ~~Question of Self~~ ^{Question of Self} ~~Submarine~~ ^{Submarine}
✓ ~~For~~ ^{For} ~~Submarine~~ ^{Submarine}
✓ ~~Submarine~~ ^{Submarine} ~~Submarine~~ ^{Submarine}

(B) ✓

~~Boston & Montreal~~

✓ 7900 ✓ 1875 Old Fort (New York)

✓ 5 1700 ✓ 1875 New York City -

✓ 1700 ✓ 1875 New York City -

X E

五 F.

1851
ECONOMIC
THEORY
SECTION

LOBED OBOES STYLE
VIRGULAR + HIGH BROW

1953
RSC-WB
LETTER

1809

1802
C 81-5964

REFERENCES TO
1982 (1982)

COMPTROLLER
OF THE
CURRENCY
ITEM -

Seize cal
1849-57
cows

SUBSIDIARY - FIDUCIARY
ERROR
P-124

2

2

4
Photos
D18
100

~~Don't know~~
~~Don't know~~
~~Don't know~~
~~Don't know~~

1807 NOTE R.

THERE IS A MAJOR CONTRADICTION BETWEEN
BETWEEN THE TEXT WRITTEN BY BREEN, ~~AND~~ THE
"CONDITION CENSUS" WRITTEN BY HANSEN AND THE
COIN PHOTOGRAPHED BY COLLINS

THE COIN ~~LEFT~~ PHOTOGRAPHED AS "STATE I" WHICH IS
ALSO ~~THE~~ USED FOR 1807 IN THE COLOR PLATE IS FROM
THE HANSEN COLLECTION. THIS COIN IS LISTED AS (S)
IN THE "CONDITION CENSUS" AS "UNCIRCULATED" YET
UNDER "REMARKS" BREEN STATES "UNCIRCULATED EXAMPLES...
... NONE FROM STATE I"

PS 10/2/72
as I cannot
be bothered
You asked me to send to you a list of
errors in the Brown Hall Cent book. I have given
the much thought and have come to realize that
a mere listing of errors would not in itself convey
my impressions and thoughts. Therefore I will
set forth what I consider to be an objective critique
of the book.

The first thing to consider is what I perceive
to be the difference in the persons and their approach
to the ^{same} subject. The basic disagreement which I have
with Walter is an intellectual one. On my mind Walter
is a Copier, an apier, a person of low capabilities
in short I perceive him to be a Pseudo-Intellectual.
To me his authorship shows this in its weird
presentation of Vernacular language mixed with
literary words and phrases which obviously he
has read or heard but ^{which he} is not able to absorb into
the banal background from which he has
come. This basic problem manifests itself in
excessive verbiage in his published works. It also
creates other ~~characteristics~~ characteristics such as
his unusual physical appearance and ^{dress} ~~his~~ ^{dress} ~~appearance~~
It also shows itself in his inability to accept
constructive criticism or acknowledge ^{errors} ~~the~~ ^{One of the} ~~the~~ ^{Another}
defensive mechanisms he has developed is
the Polarization one i.e. Like Jack Collins
told you "You're either on Roger Cohens' side
or you're on our side". To me this was one
of the most asinine statements I have heard in the
Nemours field. Another defensive mechanism is
the attempt to act as a censor of other people

Writings such as Dr Montgomerys article on Half Cent Proofs. Unfortunately for Walter this appeared in Print and the extent of her attempt became public knowledge.

When Walter finally got out his book on Half Cents he had and insisted on a total control over what was published. The intellectual deficiencies of Walter show glaringly to me in it. Many other persons have commented on the "errors" and some of them may be as aware as I am of Walters deficiencies \$ 15. See Penny Wise Sept 15, 1985 Page 262, for a synopsis by Jeff Rack, a member of "Walters side"

My criticism starts with the book's graphics which are an integral part of Walter's presentation

① The book is too big. There are excessive blank pages and the employment of a professional graphic artists or layout person would have prevented this. See Page 172 and (173), Page 288 and (289), and Page 305 and (306) for example. There are many others. ~~The book does not have a professional look about it~~

② The "Contents" pages. (vi and vii) have numbers and while the roman numeral pages can be found ^{in the back all day} the remaining arabic numerals were not put on their pages. This makes the "Contents" page useless. It also ~~indicates~~ ^{is} a lack of coordination ^{and} just plain sloppy work.

③ The binding is of very poor quality for the weight of the signatures. My copy is not the only one that is falling apart

④ The typesetting has been done from at least 3 different fonts of type and the paste-up is crooked in some cases

⑤ The camera image for printing is not evenly done on some pages which impairs the

readability of some pages.

- ⑥ The photography of lower grade coins has resulted in some very poor pictures most notably the coin pictured on page 182. This same coin ^{OBVERSE} is pictured in my 2nd edition on page 28. The ~~same~~ ^{COINS} on page 190 ^{are} another example of a low grade coin with a very poor picture.

These types of "errors" are ~~so~~ more in the area of being things that show the inadequacy of a tyro or neophyte to the publishing field. To me it ~~also~~ brings back a statement you made in a letter to me in 1971 that "the book should be a monument to its author" in other respect the book fails to live up to that standard starts here in the graphics area and continues down hill.

The next area concerns what I consider to be major ~~areas~~ misstatements through out the book involving the rarity of varieties and the condition census. It is indeed fortunate that the Numismatic fraternity has my book when it comes to rarity otherwise if Walter's Ratings were the only ones, the continued overstatements contained in ^{his} ~~the~~ book would become gospel. I have counted 11 varieties which are higher and only 1 (1800) which rates lower. The most pronounced error ^{can} ~~is~~ find involves the 1804 (G-10, C-4, B 2:28) By adding the number ^{mentioned} ~~mentioned~~ in the condition census ^{action} 16 coins are mentioned for a rating of "R-6, nearly R-5". In the November 15, 1984 issue of Penny Wreath I mentioned that about 60 examples were known to me. From my records I published as a one page ^{to my first edition} supplement in October 1976 that this variety was ^{like then} ~~at~~ an R-5 in my opinion. ^{7.210} ~~which~~ was based on my physical count. It almost seems that Walter is reluctant to admit that the variety is no

Foot note

1/26
1/27
1/28

File
Wore
Concise

longer an R-7 which he has touted it to be in his Past writings in Auction Catalogues.

Another "error" might be considered ^{to be} the statement on Page (169) "as a Majority of half Cents of the first two Varieties come overstruck on Talbot, Allen & Lee tokens" Then refer to Page 180 where it is stated that the "Rolled Copper, Not overstruck" Variety 2a: 2-a (R) is ^{rated} as rarity 4. On Page 183 Variety 2c: 2-A (T) is rated as "Rarity 5, Possibly R-6". The statement on P 169 says the 2c is more common than the 2a yet the rarity ratings assigned ^{state that we} would have one believing that 2a is more common than 2c!!

This type of ~~error~~ ^{Contradictory statements} abounds in the book. When just comparing what is ⁱⁿ the text prepared written by Walter. The problem as I see it is that an editor was ^{needed} who had knowledge of the subject matter. Walters egotism said to him that such a person does not exist yet this error was called to my attention by a person just casually interested in the subject. The type of person who Jon Hansen would refer to as "one of the scurrying little mice".

The Conclusion Census was prepared according to Walter by Jon Hansen. This is probably true up to a certain extent as I believe Walter used this data but did not edit it with a critical eye. There are so many contradictory points which arise when comparing the text prepared by Walter to Jon's Conclusion Census. My copy of Walter's book has so many notes of contradictions and errors I could not begin to list all of them rather I am enclosing one variety namely the Payson 1807

CONCLUSION

SET
SEPARATE

Study W had ~~the same~~ on those pages. The basic thing is that Walter and I have different ways of doing things, and as I've previously stated Walter is not Original he is an open and ^{description of} his ~~reference to~~ Francis Worcester Doughty on Page 7 of his book adequately describes my opinion of him.

Harrison has listed only about 60% of the coins that ^{could} ~~would~~
a Constitution Census. I believe that this liberality was

Cause of this deficiency in the book is none other than
Dan's attitude toward other collectors. ~~and~~ He is commonly
referred to as "The Great Black Hole" which means that
as a collector if you give him information nothing is
returned. I therefore over the last 15 years or so Dan
has not been privy ^{to any of} to new discoveries.

While data was being put together for the book I did receive inquiries from ^{certain persons} Ron Galt as to ^{some} certain varieties. ~~and~~ I realized that this data would be ~~used~~. Probably he used ^{→ in Walter's book.} to him to carry favor with Walter. ~~My~~ an example of the ^{to} shown on the CC listing of the 1794 (B 2a:2B) or (C-2b) where I deliberately made certain errors which have shown up just as I gave them to Galt. This same comment applies to 1795 (B-2b:2A) or (C-2b) or (A-8) and 1795 (B 5b:3-c) or (C-5b)

The chains of ownership (pedigrees) listed by ~~Jan~~
~~Hansen~~ have an incredible number of blunders.
 the ^{worst} ~~best~~ example ^{concerns} the coin listed on Page 115
 starting with "Matthew A Stickney Collection" and ending
 with "Arlington Collective" which is M.E. I was unaware
 that M.E. coin had such an illustrious background until I
 received my copy of Walter's book. I then looked at the
 Stickney Catalogue where lat 1676 was plated. There was
 a photo of the obverse only and from the angle that
 the photo was taken it could be determined that the edge
 lettering was up in relation to the obverse. The coin
 I have has edge lettering which is down in ^{relation} ~~relationship~~
 to the obverse. Thus my coin from Consequent H
 of Stacks Bowers Sale of 1970 CAN NOT BE the
 Stickney Specimen! For me to list all ^{of these} ~~the~~ errors
 in ^{Walter's} ~~the~~ book ^{that I am aware of} would take me days of writing. I doubt
 that it would even cover 50% of the errors. Most every
 Half Cent collector has notes on Pedigree errors such
 as I have described above. The ^{pedigree} information presented
 in the book can be classified in one short phrase, ~~it~~
 "a total batch"

Another incredible blunder concerns ^a ~~the~~ coins
 listed on Page 182 under 1797 (B 26:2A). It is
 identified as starting at "Early American Coppers Sale"
 which was catalogued by Walter. Frank Wilkinson
 called me back in April of ¹⁹⁸⁶ ~~this year~~ after getting
 a copy of the catalogue with the amazing news
 that the coin plated in the catalogue was not even
 dated 1797 rather it was a 1795!! This
 type of error is so bad and when its known
 I believe it ^{reduces} ~~shakes~~ the ^{accuracy} ~~total~~ veracity of
 the book as a whole.

There is another item which I feel must mentioned and this involves an item which is located in the National Archives. The Archives catalogues this item as the "account Book for the Delivery of Cents and Half Cents 1796-1803" Walter refers to this item on Page ¹³⁹ (5) + ¹⁴¹ of his ~~Half Cent~~ book as "The CENT BOOK 1796-1803, a workbook kept by the ^{COINER'S} ~~Coining~~ Department at the Philadelphia Mint [Henry Voigt and Adam Eckfeldt]" This is not the first time that Walter has used this ~~book~~ item for ^{reference} ~~research~~. Back in 1954 with the Publication by Wayne Raymond of "US Minor Coinage 1792-1796" Walter quoted from this archives item and for the first time stated that it was a work book kept by the Coining Department of the Mint. This basic Phorone ^{is} ~~was~~ repeated in other Numismatic articles and books such as Don Taxay Various Writings which as I understand it were basically "borrowed" from Walter. This item of Archives information is repeatedly quoted as "the work book of the Coining Dept." and this statement which ^{was} originated by Walter has become gospel. For example see Page 1570 of the August 1986 NUMISMATIST where the author builds a full story about Henry Voigt and by ~~quoting~~ Taxay repeats this item which originated with Walter, which UNFORTUNATELY IS NOT TRUE!!!

This may be cited as an intellectual argument but it is a foundation piece of Walter's "research" which I consider to be defective. In short it is the type of error made by the Pseudo-Intellectual and true to form even after the error is pointed out he refuses to change his Original Position.

CONCLUSIVE
Set
separate

When I began my archives research in

1969

~~1970~~ This Archives item was one of the first things I looked at. The reason I even went to the Archives was to verify what Walter had written. Frankly I was amazed at the amount of Baldersdash that Walter had put out from his ^{SKIMMING} ~~Research~~ at the archive records. When it came to the "account book" I could hardly believe my eyes. Here was an ~~early~~ accountancy book. kept with debits and credits and it was very obvious to me ^{as an accountant} ~~from~~ the debits and credits that the keeper of the account book was the Ments Treasurer NOT THE COINOR. I pointed this out in Penny Wise for September 1973 (P216) when I discussed the emission sequence of 1797. I have also pointed this out in my First Edition ^{Page} 224 out my Second edition Page 24, 25, 26, 31 + 39. In 1982 I explained this point to Ron Guth while he was visiting the Archives. He reported back to me that on the inside cover of the book there is the following inscription. "Property of ^{NICHOLS} ~~Walters~~ Way" Or way was the Ments THESAURER from 1794 until 1797 when he died of Yellow Fever. ^{HE} ~~and~~ obviously started the ^{"ACCOUNT BOOK"} record in 1796.

~~Walter Book also has another~~
~~Walters Book~~

Continuing with my ~~critical~~ ^{long} criticism of Walter's book I believe that there ~~has~~ been a number of substantial departures ~~from~~ established Venusian standards.

First is Walter's grading system set forth on Page 39. This system is not Sheldon nor is it the A-N-D system but a third system of standards. As I read it I can ^{across} ~~across~~ see contradictions in how to determine an "Extremely Fine" from an

FOOT NOTE

Despite a
CONTRADICTORY
STATEMENT ON
PAGE 37.

"about uncirculated" How does one determine the difference between "the slightest touch of rubbing on the highest points" from "Traces of rubbing! ^{the which only more correctly} use of Numeral grade has also been deleted. While grading has become a more difficult task each year for Numismatists what is not needed is still another set of standards.

Secondly, the Photographic Grading Guide Pages (41) to 61 can only be described as a farce.

There is no excuse for leaving out so many representative grade sections. Further, only 7 representative grades are to be pictured out of a total of 12 ^{grades} points on the scale set forth on Page 39. ^{which is further} (See P 41)

Thirdly, The creation of sub varieties ~~from~~ from Planchet sources in a number of cases is highly debatable in a number of cases. Most notably the 1797 (b: 1-7) 1797 (1a: 1A) ^{AND} 1795 (1a: 1B-D). Even the concept of Planchet sources as a basis for a sub variety is ^{substantial} a departure from established Numismatic ^{standards} and is admitted to by the author on Page (85). ^{insert}

Fourth The subvariety set forth as 1804 (4: 1-B) is ^(B) no more than an early die state of what is called 1804 (4q: 1-B) and again represents another departure from established Numismatic standards and these ^{set forth on Pages 64-65 of the book.}

Fifth is the concept that each die variety or sub variety has Numeral die states. This has created considerable confusion among collectors and the creation of "State VII 1/2" designation, or coins described as "obverse State II reverse State IV". The origin of the use of Numeral die states appears to be Gilbert Treatise of his 1804 Variety & No. 8. Gilbert apparently wanted to designate easily distinguishable states and not differentiate between such minor increase ⁱⁿ dies deterioration. Walter has taken this concept and worked ^{it} to the point of absurdity, which I again believe is another

Walter stops back in time and copies Clapp.!!

→ SUBSTANTIAL

See Sheldon's Critique of Clapp's use of Lettered die states for 1796 in "Early American Coins"

See Sheldon's Critique of Clapp's use of Lettered die states for 1796 in "Early American Coins"

(INSERT 17) OVER

even though on p 67 he modifies his concept by indicating that he did state only the approximate

departure from established Numismatic standards?

The Next order of Criticism concerns the Copying of Previously Published Material without Footnoting ^{or verifying} the Source. This mainly concerns my Second Edition but includes other items. On Page 10 Walter writes that in regard to my book that "A revision is in the Press" What he does not say is that he has referred to my Second Edition and taken information from it quite freely and carefully omitted any reference to this source.

^{Foot Note} First Consider the Coin Plated on Page 38 at ~~1853~~ ¹⁸⁵² ~~dated 1853~~. My Second Edition of Variety #1 of 1852. Dr. Walter has this coin as identified as being from the H. Dale Kuhn Collection "by a nick on the reverse at 6 o'clock". This coin was not made available for photography during the assembly of Walter's book therefore the only source for the identification to the H. Dale Kuhn Collection was my Second Edition.

^{Foot Note} Secondly in Describing, what Walter refers to as. 1852 [1*: 1-A] ORIGINAL, in my Second Edition I referred to this item as one that "does NOT exist" (P 122). I also stated that Mr. George H. Biese had started a "search" that has not ended" (P 121). Then on P (438) of Walter Book there is a Paragraph which begins "The search may not be forever in vain for this authentic original Proof of 1852". I consider this to be more than a Coincidence I also note that the type style is different and the spacing of the Paragraphs is different from the remainder of the Page leading me to the Conclusion that the Paragraph was written, typeset and added after reading my Comments in my Second Edition which on Page 10 of Walter Book is mentioned only as being a "revision (is) in the Press".

^{Foot Note} Walter Bower also does a Complete about Face when the Emission Sequence of 1797 dated coins are considered.

Back in 1973 on the paper of Perry Wiese Val. VII (P 214 ²¹⁵ - ~~214~~)
 Walter states that the order of emission of these coins
 started with the Lettered edge specimens and he repeated
 the same line of reasoning ^{originally} set forth in his 1954 article
 on "U.S. Minor Coppers 1792-1916". For his book however he
 has adopted my reasoning ^{with numerous references} set forth on page 216 of Vol III of
Perry Wiese with the minor exception of the interrupted
 markings for Variety #1 which is ~~disproven~~ ^{disproven} with.

The Material on 1800 (P 201) ~~Walter book~~ contains a
 number of incidents of Copying and Failure to Verify
 information. The departure date of April 19 (1800) of the
 Six Casks of Philadelphia is directly copied from my book. The
^{departure} actual date was April 17. I had elaborately put April
 19 just to see if anyone would copy without verification
 and in this case I was not disappointed. Further the
 weight of 200 WT. 20 LB. 10 OZ., is ^{an} full long ton !!
 Not 1/5 of a ton !! See Footnote 163 P. (211) for the
 explanation of the overdupis system of weight. The error
 was originally in Robert W. Julian's article covered by
 Foot Note 158 in Walter book and again shows the failure
 to verify ^{or even consider} what was being copied.

Another Failure to Verify error concerns State III of
 1805, 3: 2-c (P. 264). This item was copied from Perry Wiese
 Vol X, P. 178 (7/15/76) in which Melt Pfeffer quoted a
 letter from M.A. as to the existence of this die state.
 At that time I believed that such a state existed as I had
 an example which has subsequently been determined to
 be merely a damaged specimen.

I have also noted that on P (319) that Walter has
 failed to footnote his source of the letter from Boulton on
 September 22, 1824. This is another case where I changed the
 date by a few days just to see if my research would be
 blindly copied ^{without verification} again I was not disappointed. The reference to
 the August 10, 1824 letter is very significant and totally

Muller's Walter oft Quoted statement which is repeated ^{often} that "Coinage of Half Cents was unexpectedly resumed in the last quarter of the year [1825]..."

The 1826 # 2:2-B, with the 2 star break, (Breen State V) P. 327. Continues the chronicle set forth on P 10 where the revision of M^y book is mentioned as "being in the Press". In listing the ^{known} number of specimens one is ~~then~~ the following phrase is used. "one other mentioned by Cohen". The Breen book accounts for 5 specimens which ties exactly to M^y 2nd Edition (P 82) and is the only place I have ever "mentioned" the number of known specimens.

In addition to the about face in regard to the misleading sequence of the 1797 dated Coin another Variety 1803 4:1-D P. (220)-221 has undergone a complete about face, which Contrary to the 1797 dated Coin has not been the subject of a ^{possible} debate such as on 1797. In my first edition (P 48) I wrote out why I felt behind the Variety to be an 1805 strike. What I didn't state was that the reason for the rather long winded explanation was the result of a conversation with Mr Breen in December 1970. At that time Mr Breen stated that "there was no question that the die saved for further use was the reverse die". In October 1981 ^{Some 11 Years later,} while attending a coin convention in Long Beach CA. Mr Breen made available to the assembled gathering Pages ^(mentioned on P 10 of the "revised") of his forth coming "Encyclopedia of US Coins". In the checking this ^{dated coin was} "Monumental" undertaking I noted that 1797 was listed as set forth in his 1954 tale (US MINOR COINAGE 1792-1916) and that the 1803 Variety under consideration was listed as the first Variety of 1803. It is quite apparent that sometime after October 1981 Mr Breen revised his thinking based on my First and Second Editions. Since there had been a public dispute on the Pages of Terry White in regard to the 1797 dated Coinage he could not ignore

FOOT
NOTE

FOOT
NOTE

^{the debate in Perry Weir}
 this. However when it come to the 1803 Variety
 4:1-D Mr Breen has gone to great length to
 set forth on P 212 (right column) his "Original" research
^{Paraphrase}
~~copied almost verbatim~~ from my writings without
 any footnote as to the source of his ^{information} ~~thinking~~. An
 addition as noted in Perry Weir Vol No. P. (Jan 15
 1985) Mr Breen criticizes Pruskey, Bass and Gilbert for
 making this mistake while he himself made this mistake
 for a period of at least 27 years!!

The Photography of the book is a subject that
 has received considerable comment and I do believe that
~~there~~ the standards as to size 3" for Variety illustrations
 and 2" for other illustrations is a definite improvement over
 the manner of presentation in my 2 previous editions. It
 is quite apparent that any further work books on
 this subject will have to have many illustrations which
 will by its very nature cause a considerable increase in
 size of any book. Despite these laudatory comments there
 are a number of deficiencies in the Breen book ~~also~~ that
 are not readily apparent at first reading.

First is the use of Composite Photos which are not
 indicated. The problem here ^{will be} ~~is to~~ ^{recognized} ~~rectified~~ with in the
^{PHOTOGRAPHY}
 future as the inclusion of a coin in a book seems to increase
 its Pedigree Value. Mr Breen ~~also~~ ^{is a past example of this} indicates on P 257
 with the search for the Gilbert plate coin of 1804, 5:1a-c (C-7).
 Will the future collector wonder where the Plate coin
 of 1793, 3:2-B ^{(P.76) 9} is? when in fact the ^{3"} illustration is a
 Composite of two specimens owned currently by one collector.
 This same Composite is used on the Calan Plate for 1793.
 Other Composites noted ^{to date} are on P. 88, 187, 200, 204, 206, 232,
^{390, 393, 398, 406,}
 388, 410, 412, 416, 419, 421, 425, 444. There are also Composites in
^{AND}
 the Calan Plates other than 1793 to date I have noted, 1795,
 1803, 1808 and 1836. There are probably others.

Secondly is the use of "Representative" Coins. On P 165

1845

2nd

H-1705E

AIR

BAUSCH

a well known and respected coin from the
 Anderson - DuPont Collection is used to represent a
 Sub Variety^("stretched slightly"). However on Page 176 for 1797, 16:1-A
 the coin illustrated is obviously a "representative" coin
 even though this fact is not disclosed. The existence
 of the sub variety is based on Mr Breen's substantial
 departure from established Numismatic standards previously
 mentioned. ("Stretched slightly") ~~Previously covered~~. The candidate
 census has 1 specimen and a genuine statement in regard
 to "two or three others". The single specimen listed is from
 the Ruby Sale of 1973 and is currently in a "private collection"
 which is the books. enthusiasm for coins in ~~collectors~~ the hands
 of persons unknown to ~~the~~ Messrs. Breen and Hanson. ^H At
 the time of the Ruby Sale I examined the coin which was
 described in the Catalogue^{authored} by Mr Breen as "undecipherable
 undertype which has some appearance of being a bracteage
 cent". My observation^{of the coin was} ~~was~~ that the undertype was that
 of a 1794 T&T Token. Had it been an undertype of a cent the
 price realized would have been in excess of \$60. The inclusion
 of this^{as a} subvariety ("stretched slightly") is due solely to the fact
 that the National Archives records indicate that on Feb 6, 1799
 large cents were ~~rolled~~ ^{rolled} down for half cents thus it is
 possible that the Combination 1-A was used on ~~on~~ the
 Planchet source. However to date I have heard of no example
 which can be classified unequivocally as being ~~from~~ ^{struck} over a
 large cent.

The final item in regard to photography is that one
 which is critical of the books presentation of data ~~but~~ ^{both} and
~~one of consequence~~ ^{the} of methods used by the compiler. On
 page (198) as Breen State II the coin photographed is
 from my collection, ^{which} and is also photographed in my second
 edition P 34. Just how the coin can be classified under
 Mr Breen's "stretched slightly" standards as being from a large
 cent Planchet when no undertype shows is beyond my

(P. 199 under ECHOGRAPHY)

Good Census. Mr Breen also states [↓] that this sub variety was "unknown to previous writers" yet it was mentioned by Don Toxay in his 1966 book _____ P. and his 1971 Book _____ P. David Bower also mentioned back in 1967 this subvariety ("stretched slightly") when he was selling the discovery specimen found by Dr Stanley P. West in 1967. This specimen which is ^{Green Book} not listed in the Candelion Census is currently owned by a Northern New Jersey collector. I also mentioned in my First Edition

^{Footnote} P 26 that while I had not seen a specimen that could be recognized as Presumably such specimens existed. In April 1972 P. Scott Rubin sent me ² specimens for my examination and our correspondence appeared in Penny Wise Vol III (July 15, 1972), P. 164 which has been used by Mr Breen as Foot Note 157 on P 189. I could not help but note that Mr Breen did not note who ~~the~~ reported the four specimens at that time.

Just how one of my Coins came to be photographed and used in Mr Breen's book without any acknowledgment of its source is an ~~very~~ interesting story. It goes back to the October 1981 Long Beach CA Coin show when Mr Breen and Mr Collins announced that the book under consideration was "at the printers and should be out three months from now". In response to a series of observations voiced by California dealer Jack Baynes in regard to my Coin Mr Breen asked if I would make it available for his inspection which I readily agreed to for the next day when the show reopened. After Mr Breen's inspection he wished to have it photographed which again I agreed to despite what had been a generally hostile approach to me and my collector. After the photography I requested ^{Verification of} certain information from Mr Breen which as expected was denied.

The Breen Book leaves much to be desired when ^{considering} contemplating an emission sequence ^{& course}. It is noted that diagrams such as I used in ^{my} first and second Editions are omitted in the book under Consideration. On Pages (85) and 86 My Two Press theory is mentioned and then dismissed as by the statement "This is possible but unlikely" and the reader is referred to "Course of 1804-06," below, p 223, which remains unnumbered but includes Pages 224 and 225. I have nicknamed the Chapter either "The Dancing Dies" or "The Duffers Dream"

On the left hand column of P 224 Mr. Breen explains why there must be this complicated arrangement. It is quite obvious that the emission sequence set forth in My book can not be agreed to as it is much to simplify.

Mr Breen then falls into a discussion of the 5 Coining Presses at the Mint in the 1804-1806 Period. The discussion is backed up with a footnote (174) quoting a letter circa ¹⁹⁵⁶ ~~1856~~.